



SUMMARIZED MINUTES

NEIGHBORHOOD ENHANCEMENT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING Thursday, February 9, 2006 Civic Center Conference Room 3rd Floor, One Civic Center 7447 E. Indian School Road

- PRESENT:** John Shultz, Chairman
Patricia Badenoach, Vice-Chair
Lisa Haskell, Commissioner (arrived at 5:38 p.m.)
John Horwitz, Commissioner
Aaron Kern, Commissioner (arrived at 5:33 p.m.)
Jim Pompe, Commissioner
Christine Schild, Commissioner (arrived at 5:38 p.m.)
- STAFF:** Raun Keagy, Director, Neighborhood Services and Preservation
Joanie Mead, Neighborhood Education Manager
- GUESTS:** Ed Gawf, Deputy City Manager
Frank Gray, Planning & Development Services General Manager

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chairman Shultz called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m. A roll call confirmed the presence of Commissioners as noted above.

1. Approval of December 7, 2005 Minutes

VICE-CHAIR BADENOCH MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2005 MEETING. COMMISSIONER POMPE SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED WITH A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO ZERO (0).

2. Review of Neighborhood Enhancement Commission (NEP) Audit.

Mr. Keagy began the discussion by noting the need for Council action to formalize the Commission's ability, as public stewards, to make recommendations. When the plan was reviewed, the Commission concurred with all of the recommendations, many of which have already been implemented. Mr. Keagy clarified that this is not yet on the City Council agenda. The audit indicated this would be done by June 2006. Staff are prioritizing the recommendations.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Horwitz, Mr. Keagy assured Commissioners that funds for recently approved applications will be allocated. He recommended that the Commission not plan the Spring HOA application review at this time. Discussion ensued. Mr. Keagy explained that by July 1, 2006, the Commission should have its guidelines reworded and authorized by City Council to coincide with the Commission's new budget for fiscal year '06-'07.

Mr. Keagy clarified the steps of the recommendation process for Commission Members as follows:

- 1) Commission gives a recommendation
- 2) the Applicant completes the project
- 3) Applicant submits an invoice to City Council mirroring the recommended amount along with before/after photos
- 4) the invoice is then submitted to the accounting office for the check.

The Commission discussed whether future projects needed to be submitted individually to City Council. Mr. Keagy reminded the Commission that whenever the Commission approves an amount greater than \$20,000, the request must be approved by City Council.

Commissioner Pompe suggested that the Commission continue reviewing applications until City Council requests otherwise.

Mr. Keagy summarized the process to take place resulting from the Audit:

- 1) Staff will prepare new ordinance language for City Council review.
- 2) the new Ordinance will come before the Neighborhood Enhancement Commission for review before City Council's approval
- 3) based on the Ordinance, the Commission will then review/revise its guidelines.

Definitions/Additions for Guidelines:

Discussion followed regarding City Council's issue with the Commission's definition of "neighborhood groups", as currently defined in the Guidelines. Mr. Keagy recalled the previous discussion regarding the possibility of adding community-based projects

to the Citizen & Neighborhood Resources department's operating budget, such as the annual Treasures 'n Trash event. Commissioner Schild noted that as more liberal guidelines are developed, the Commission must ensure that the definitions are consistent with their actions. Commissioners concurred that overly specific guidelines could be a hindrance.

Mr. Keagy encouraged the Commission to find ways to measure the results and success of programs. All Commissioners concurred that obtaining applicant testimony would be one way to measure success.

Discussion followed regarding possible additions to the Guidelines such as:

- 1) a broader requirement for before/after applicant consequences
- 2) a clear community project definition
- 3) include more community or large projects

Mr. Keagy pointed out that the Neighborhood Enhancement Commission represents the entire City of Scottsdale, and this is a great opportunity to solidify the Commission's role in the revitalization process. In the course of the discussion, Commissioner Schild noted that a sub-committee could be established to deal with the ordinance/guideline procedural issues and another sub-committee to deal with the strategic planning issues.

Chairman Schultz suggested that this topic be put on the next agenda for further discussion and the establishment of sub-committees. Mr. Keagy noted that the Commission needs a clear vision of its role and goals to ensure that the guidelines match the allocation process before presenting it to City Council.

3. Presentation and Discussion Regarding Possible Changes to the R1-7 Zoning District.

Chairman Shultz introduced Frank Gray, Planning & Development Services General Manager. Mr. Gray reviewed the R1-7 Ordinance text changes, explaining that the current zoning ordinance discourages reinvestment in older neighborhoods.

Staff have been interviewing stakeholders such as realtors, property owners, bankers, etc. They note the following issues:

- 1) side yard setback restrictions
- 2) limited provisions for carport conversions
- 3) front yard parking
- 4) home structures being built out of hollow block
- 5) maintenance and use of alleys (parking—improvements—trash collection)
- 6) availability of water and sewer lines

7) storage and storage sheds

With regard to item number 1 above, Mr. Gawf explained that privacy is one of the main issues when dealing with homes being converted to two-story buildings.

Commissioner Schild stated, concerning item 5 above, that if people were allowed to build garages at the back of their property, it would increase the need for alley maintenance. However, it would encourage investment in the older neighborhoods.

Discussion identified that subdivisions on septic tanks do not have water/sewer available, hindering development and improvement. What role should the public play in the installation of sewer/water lines and requiring redevelopment to attach to the water/sewer lines?

A discussion followed regarding neighborhoods on septic tanks, and who bears the cost. Mr. Gray reported that the main issue is not money but concerns about public health and hindrances to development of the lot.

With regard to item 7 above, it was cited that homes without attics, small closets, or basements create the issue of storage. How many sheds should be allowed; what can be stored in them; and what types of rules/regulations should there be?

Mr. Gray presented a graph of R1-7 zoning districts color-coded to reflect non-conformance lots and condo conversions occurring around the R1-7 neighborhoods. He outlined the process of gathering community input through open houses. The Planning Commission will review a draft reflecting the public input in April, after which it will be presented to City Council.

Mr. Gray cautioned that homes will be demolished for rebuilding if the ordinances are not changed. In the ensuing discussion, it was noted that zoning requirements for rebuilding are less restrictive. Commissioner Haskell opined that everyone should be made aware of the changes and improvements the City is planning.

Mr. Gawf recommended that Mr. Gray return for recommendations from the Commission before appearing before the Planning Commission. Mr. Gray also invited the Commission to attend the City open houses.

4. Update on SkySong (ASU Scottsdale) Project.

Chairman Shultz introduced Ed Gawf, Deputy City Manager. Mr. Gawf reported that the ASU Scottsdale SkySong project was approved by City Council with suggested changes to the plans.

Mr. Gawf noted that the architects demonstrated greater responsiveness to the climate. Repositioning SkySong in the center as a focal point was a significant change.

The DRB supported the project after the suggested changes were met, and groundbreaking took place on January 20th. Construction plans are currently being prepared and construction will begin in April 2007.

Mr. Gawf presented a diagram showing the Phase One components. He reported on plans to build structured parking as part of the first phase. He noted that the old Los Arcos Crossings presents a greater challenge because of long-term leases and the price of some parcels.

Highlights of the presentation included the Scottsdale Road improvements, the design on McDowell, the plans for the new Lowe's, changing the image of McDowell, and the relocation of the Senior Center to the former Smitty's site.

Mr. Gawf reported that staff spent a Saturday morning in November canvassing the neighborhood south of the Papago Service Center, going door-to-door to 600 homes to explain what was going on and providing a package with a coupon for a free smoke detector. Homeowners were invited to a picnic to meet City Council members. This event was a big success. Staff plan to canvass the neighborhood east of Miller, south of McDowell and west of Hayden on March 11, and will continue with other neighborhoods in the fall.

The Commission requested that Mr. Gawf provide information on upcoming events.

Mr. Gawf reported that the southern Scottsdale revitalization project is progressing well. Vice-Chair Badenoch requested that the LEED program be discussed.

Mr. Gawf clarified that the SkySong project buildings are privately funded. Buildings such as the Senior Citizen Center are going for the gold standard, and ASU Scottsdale must meet LEED standards. Mr. Gawf stated that this might be the largest office park in Arizona to be LEED certified.

5. Staff and Commission Updates (A.R.S. § 38-431.02 (K))

Ms. Mead distributed information on Saturday's event at Supai High School along with copies of two thank you notes. The first note was from Chair Lenko of the Scottsdale Pride Committee thanking the Commission for funding the Treasures 'n Trash event in the fall. The second note was from the President of La Vida, an HOA whose application was approved in December.

Ms. Mead reported that the monthly printout reflects a balance of \$36,070, as of 02/06/06, to be used through June 30, 2006. This is the full amount available, not including what is currently encumbered. The beginning budget for 07/01/06 is \$75,000. A new budget amount of \$100,00 has been requested, which should be decided upon in May or June.

Discussion followed regarding what the Commission needs to do in order to support a future request for a significant budget increase. Chairman Shultz recommended that the guidelines should include a provision that the Commission be permitted to recommend the budget amounts for future years.

Ms. Mead explained that previously the NEC had \$125,000 since whatever was left over at the end of the year rolled over, because it was considered a capital account. As a result of the audit, next year the Commission will not have a capital account. The funds will be in an operating account. Craig Clifford, Financial Services General Manager, has informed her that there is a way to roll the money remaining at the end of the year into next year's budget for this type of program.

Discussion ensued about the budget funding process and the fact that the request is submitted to City Council as a line item. Ms. Mead reported that they also submitted a decision package for this particular program in order to increase the budget by \$25,000.

Commissioner Horwitz suggested using part of the money to work with Mr. Gawf on a demonstration project. Ms. Mead recommended that the concept be included in strategic planning for the future as a mechanism to do specific projects such as replanting trees or other larger neighborhood beautification projects.

Continuing, Ms. Mead clarified that the outstanding commitments from the beginning of FY 2004/2005 to date total \$57,318.79.

Ms. Mead outlined the recent funding history of the Commission and summarized that if the Commission makes no further allocations before the end of June, the year-end balance will be approximately \$15,365.

Commissioner Horwitz inquired whether that amount included the \$1,500 balance not spent on south Scottsdale. Chairman Shultz indicated that the funds would be rolled back and would be lost, since it was not approved in the 2004/2005 budget.

Ms. Mead clarified that some of the NEC approved projects would not be built until the beginning of the next fiscal year. A discussion ensued regarding imposing specific timeframes, with the possibility of extensions for extenuating circumstances.

6. Open Call to the Public (A.R.S. § 38-431.02)

No members of the public wished to address the Commission.

7. Next Meeting Date and Future Agenda Items

The next NEC regular meeting will occur on Thursday, March 9, 2006. The NEP Guidelines are to be included on the March agenda for discussion.

In response to a question from Chairman Shultz, Ms. Mead indicated that Mr. Gray may return to review the R1-7 Zoning District. Commissioner Schild requested that the guidelines and Commission goals be placed on the agenda of a work-study session.

Ms. Mead mentioned that a neighborhood group called Hayden Estates, located at the northeast corner of Lincoln/Hayden, is working on an application package for submission to the Commission in March.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A/VTronics, Inc.